

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT SEATTLE

8 BEHROUZ SHOKRI.,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 THE BOEING COMPANY, a Delaware
corporation,

12 Defendant.

Case No. C16-1132 RSM

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO FILE
UNDER SEAL

13 THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Seal. Dkt. #73.
14 Defendant has not filed a response to the motion. Plaintiff seeks to file under seal Exhibits 4,
15 5, 6 and 8 to the Declaration of Scott C.G. Blankenship in Support of Plaintiff's pending
16 Motion to Compel. *Id.* These documents were marked "Confidential" by Defendant under the
17 parties' Protective Order.
18

19 "There is a strong presumption of public access to the court's files." Local Rule CR
20 5(g)(2). For nondispositive motions, "this presumption may be overcome by a showing of
21 good cause." *Id.* The Court has reviewed the motion, along with the remainder of the record,
22 and now finds good cause to GRANT the motion IN PART as follows.
23

24 The documents identified by Plaintiff as Exhibits 4, 5, and 6 to the Declaration of Scott
25 C.G. Blankenship (Dkts. #75, #76 and #77) contain information that is both proprietary in
26 nature and sensitive employment information for non-parties to this litigation. Given the

1 nature of the documents, it is not feasible to redact them, and the Court finds good cause to
2 seal them.

3 However, the Court requires further information with respect to Exhibit 8 to the
4 Declaration of Scott C.G. Blankenship (Dkt. #78) before it can reach any such conclusion.
5 Specifically, Exhibit 8 appears to contain a transcript of a conversation which could easily be
6 redacted, much of which does not appear to include confidential or proprietary information.
7 *See* Dkt. #78. Because Defendant has the burden, **Defendant** must explain the reasons why
8 that exhibit must be sealed, why it cannot be redacted, what information is required to be
9 protected, and what authority provides a basis to protect such information.
10

11 Accordingly, the Court hereby ORDERS:

- 12 1. Plaintiff's Motion to Seal (Dkt. #73) is GRANTED IN PART.
- 13 2. Exhibits 4, 5 and 6 to the Declaration of Scott C.G. Blankenship in Support of
14 Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (Dkts. #75, #76 and #77) shall REMAIN UNDER
15 SEAL.
- 16 3. No later than seven (7) days from the date of this Order, **Defendant** shall file a
17 supplemental motion to seal Exhibit 8 to the Declaration of Scott C.G. Blankenship
18 in Support of Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (Dkt. #78), explaining why such
19 document should be sealed as detailed above. **The supplemental motion shall be**
20 **noted for consideration the same day it is filed, and shall be limited to no**
21 **longer than three (3) pages in length. No response shall be filed.** If Defendant
22 no longer believes the Exhibit should be sealed, it should inform the Court as much,
23 by filing a Notice of Non-Opposition, and explain to the Court why it did not make
24
25
26

1 such stipulation during the parties' meet and confer prior to Plaintiff's motion to
2 compel and accompanying motion to seal.

- 3 4. The document filed under seal by Plaintiff at Dkt. #78 shall remain under seal until
4 the Court considers the supplemental motion and makes a final decision as to
5 whether that document should be sealed
6

7 DATED this 6th day of October 2017.

8
9 

10 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
11 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26